

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VII

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 1, 1913

No. 5

To the kindness of Professor F. W. Sanford, of the University of Nebraska, we owe knowledge of an interesting paper, by his colleague, Dr. Hartley B. Alexander, of the Department of Philosophy, which appeared in the Nebraska State Journal on September 17 last. The article was entitled *Youth and the Classics*.

Professor Alexander traces unwillingness to study the Classics to a single cause—the fact that “they lead to no vocation”.

Save only one! The pursuit of truth ought surely to be the first calling of all men. Our little individual callings—whether industrial or commercial or professional—all are made possible by what we call civilization; but civilization itself is made possible by the vocation of man as a civilized being, and that is the pursuit of truth.

Twenty years ago, says Professor Alexander, young men who were entering College turned away from the Classics because they wished to study subjects that had to do with the living truth; the Classics, they declared, opened no true road to wisdom. Vocational training had not yet been heard of.

If they turned from the knowledge of the ancients, it was because the glamorous affirmations of the great apostles of nineteenth century science seemed to them the gospel of truth. Nowadays, science for the sake of truth is going the way of the elder humanities, and we hear instead only of the “practical” (and that is to say, private) benefits of early and assiduous specialization to the narrow walks in life which each of us is expected to pursue—as if the world of men were some huge vaudeville upon whose petty stage each individual performs his local act in solitary inconsequence to what has gone before or follows after.

Science for the sake of truth has gone the way of the humanities for the sake of culture (which is but the more intimate truth of a sympathetic understanding of human nature); and in place of each of these, we are now to teach the youth of the land the vital importance of “number one”.

The same discussion, notes Professor Alexander, has been going on vigorously in France: see Dr. Ball's paper in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 5.61-63. One of the fruits of the strife is a passage by the late Henri Poincaré, which Professor Alexander quotes from *The Nation*:

“There might be a serious objection to classical studies”, wrote Poincaré. “If it is to be desired that nine out of ten Frenchmen become good mer-

chants and business men, is it not dangerous to disgust them beforehand with that which is to fill their lives? No doubt it would not be impossible to refute such an objection; but that is no business of mine. . . . I seek what must be done to form men of science. And here all is clear. The man of science ought not to tarry in the realization of practical aims; these, no doubt, he will obtain, but he must obtain them over and above. . . . Science has wonderful applications; but the science which would have in view only the applications would no longer be science—it would be only the kitchen. There is no science but disinterested science. . . . The spirit which should animate the man of science is that which breathed of old on Greece and brought there to birth poets and thinkers. There remains in our classical teaching I know not what of the old Greek soul; I know not what that makes us look ever upward. And that is more precious for the making of a man of science than the reading of many volumes of geometry”.

On this Professor Alexander comments as follows:

For those who see the question of the Classics from the angle of vocational training (it is seldom called “education”), Poincaré's argument is of little force, as a plea for the Classics. He, too, agrees that Latin and Greek lead to no profession. But for those who still believe in the importance of the pursuit of truth, for those who realize that modern science is great and helpful only because its first love is knowledge and not profit and who understand that even our material civilization—by-product, as it is, of our science—came into existence and can continue to exist only because men could value knowledge above gain—for all such Poincaré's words are a grave concern. For surely it would be a calamity to states and peoples were we to lose the talisman that points the way to truth.

With the Greeks it was a commonplace of life that our humanest appetite is love of knowledge. “All men by nature desire to know”, is the first sentence of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. “By nature!” It is this trait, so universal in Hellenic nature, that Poincaré has in mind when he speaks of “the spirit breathed of old on Greece” as that “which should animate the man of science”; and, if we read between his lines, it is this which he expects the study of the Classics to keep alive through our passing generations.

Keener than ever in the past is the feeling that human attainments, whether scientific or political, can be justly understood and criticised only in the light of the history of our civilization as a whole. The history of science is almost a new subject, with such zeal is it now pursued. Work such as that of Schiaparelli and Tannery and Duhem and Dreyer in the history of physics and astronomy is giving us new perspectives on our own achievements and a

new understanding of why we value these sciences and of how they serve as indices of progress—and yet this work is very largely but an interpretation of the thought and achievement of the ancients. Science begins with the Greeks and in a very significant sense our science is still Greek science.

Professor Alexander then remarks that beneath the individual sciences, which are only the special forms in which truth presents itself, lies that more general culture which is the parent and fosterer of them all. To win that, in any real sense, we must study civilization, which is the study of human nature at its best, and the study of truth at its highest and purest value. For us of the western world the one civilization of most value is the civilization of the Mediterranean basin. From the peoples who dominated that basin "our medicine and our law, our engineering and our commerce, as well as our abstruser mathematics and philosophy and our humaner literature and art all derive in straight descent".

Nor should we suppose, in spite of the generations of students who have sought to interpret antiquity to us, that the material is nearing exhaustion. It is no more so than is the earth's crust under the hammering of geologists. There have been few periods in this study—certainly none in recent decades—more abundant in interest and result than is the present. The whole complexion of our origins and the whole color of our institutional life is being altered in the light of new illuminations from the newly discovered past. Books are appearing every year which record discoveries and advance interpretations that acquaint us in an ever more living fashion with the roots of our thinking and the foundations of our convictions,—everyday to us, but immemorial in their history.

In this living study are many themes worth mentioning—the broadening view of the relationship of east and west as our knowledge of ancient Asia grows, the new vistas of history which are being read into Greek myths from Homer onward in the light of the excavations in Crete and the isles; the revivification of Greek drama on the modern stage, German and French and English; the growing understanding of the economic and commercial ideals of the ancient states. But among these themes none, I think, is more significant to the culture of our own day than is the penetrating study that is now being devoted to the intellectual and emotional influences at work in the western world at the time of the beginning of Christianity.

For there are few of us, I imagine, who will not agree that it is to the events which made European civilization not a mere dependency of Asiatic culture, but an independent Christendom, that we owe what most we prize. And there is surely no more fascinating chapter, as there is surely no more crucial circumstance, in the story of the growth of humanity than that which deals with the birth of Christian sentiment and hope.

There are many books nowadays—books of searching scholarship and mature judgment—dealing with aspects of this theme. In English I call to mind Glover's *Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*, and Arnold's *Roman Stoicism*, as of conspicuous interest. But I would mention more particularly the new edition of a work by an American scholar, now in its second decade; for it surely

speaks well for the vitality of the interest in the Classics, as well as for the scholarly excellence of the work, that Henry Osborne Taylor's *Ancient Ideals* (The Macmillan Company) is called for in a second edition. There are two reasons why it should here receive an especial mention. The first is because of the comprehensiveness with which it treats the theme to which we have just alluded. For the author takes the whole range of ancient civilizations, Asiatic as well as European, into his account, giving us an inward and spiritual interpretation of the life whose outward dress we get in our political histories. Egypt and India and Persia as well as Greece and Rome and Israel fall into the scope of his large-modelled narrative, and for the life of each he seeks to give us a portrait which will show not what men were in their outward being so much as what, in their endeavors, sometimes blind and sometimes illumined, they aspired to be. And this aspirational meaning of human endeavor, shown most of all in literature and in art, is after all what most we value in human nature, and what least we are willing to lose from our heritage from the past.

I cannot here enter into a discussion of Taylor's treatment of his theme, for it is too big to be put aside with a word. But I would mention that he makes the advent of Christianity the key to his interpretation of the occidental mind, which theme he carries forward in his great companion study, *The Mediaeval Mind* (also Macmillan). But I would come to my second point. And this is that no reader of *Ancient Ideals* can fail to feel the value and distinction of that quality which comes from a first-hand acquaintance with the classical authors—the value of Greek and Latin in the curriculum.

Much, very much, can be gained in knowledge of ancient life from the books of interpretation which are being made for us—translations, commentaries, histories, intimate essays—but in the end there is always an intangible somewhat which can be gleaned only from the ipsissima verba, the very words, of sage and poet. Even a smattering of the classical tongues is helpful in this respect, while every gain in intimate understanding of the ancient languages is a widening of intellectual powers.

That such study is worth while not only for the individual student, for his own life's sake, but also for the state and nation—in order that the culture and spirit of the past may be kept alive, and in order that our own culture, whose life is, in so large a sense, still the life of the past, may be preserved—thoughtful men and men great in science as men great in letters and the arts proclaim to-day as valiantly as ever in the years gone by. And it may be that the time is not so far distant when our young men, as to-day the young men of France, will stand ready to demand that encouragement to a humanistic training which is their right and the right of posterity. Nor can it be doubted that when educators stand ready to recommend, the students will be eager to follow; and the study of Greek and Latin will no longer seem but the impractical preparation of the impractical. For in those days public education will be modelled for the good of the state, which will be seen to be also the good of the individual.

Utterances such as these, coming from those who are not primarily concerned with the Classics, who cannot be taunted with the charge that their own relation to the Classics is directly vocational, will

always find a warm welcome from THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY. We are glad to set Professor Alexander's paper in our special treasure-house of valued utterances from coadjutors in other fields—statements by large-minded and broad-visioned student who realize that their own work is sure to be barren, or at least to fall short of fullest fruition, unless they and their students both enjoy freely and fully the classical heritage. In this special treasure-store are e.g. the paper by Professor Sherman, on English and the Latin Question, in 5.201-203, 209-213, and Professor Cooper's paper, referred to in 6.73-74.

What Professor Alexander says of the claim of the Classics to recognition on the ground that they lead to the noblest of all vocations (and, one might add, avocations)—the search for truth for its own sake—reminds me of the earnest pleas made by Paulsen, in his *German Universities* (English translation), for the Faculty of Philosophy as the one Faculty of the University which exists for research and nothing else. In what Paulsen says lies, to my mind, the answer to most of the criticism made in this country of the current course for the Doctor's degree.

That Professor Alexander was setting up no mere man of straw when he declared that opposition to the Classics springs largely from the idea that they lead to no vocation may be shown, if necessary, by a reference to a book entitled *The American College*, by Abraham Flexner (The Century Company, 1908), 18-21: "Nothing tangible depends on Greek and Latin; they lead nowhere". Lead nowhere? we may, if we will, answer in terms of the 'practical', by reference to the book so well edited by Professor Kelsey, *Latin and Greek in American Education* (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 5.89-90, 97-98). The author of a book so frankly vocational as Mr. Flexner's could scarce understand an answer made in terms of those things of the spirit on which Professor Alexander so well insists. C. K.

A THEORY CONCERNING THE ORIGIN AND THE AFFILIATIONS OF THE CULT OF VESTA¹

Throughout Latin literature Vesta's cult is closely connected with the worship of homely divinities—Lares, Penates, Di Indigetes, Romulus—and the festival, the Vestalia, celebrated in her honor on the ninth of June was clearly a primitive ritual in which the goddess was viewed as the patroness of the home, not of its reverend hearth, but of its welcome and sustaining loaf. It was the feast of the bread-makers, when all the millstones were crowned with wreaths and the poor asses that turned them had a holiday, being, indeed, the very celebrants in the procession around the city. A

quaint sight the beasts must have been, decked with garlands and marching in triumphal pomp. Whatever penitential ceremonies there were fell to the lot of women, who formed another procession, pacing bare-footed to the temple of the goddess and to the altar of Jupiter Pistor, Jupiter the Bread-Maker! The miller, the bread-maker, the baker, and the asses—these were the favored on this gala day set apart to Vesta's glory.

The perpetual fire of the hearth, both of the home and of the city, the detail to us most familiar in this divinity's worship, speaks of more solemn things, the benefits and the sanctities of home life. It carries also suggestion of Greek rites, as of the Mother of the Gods, of Prometheus, and of Hephaestus, wherein the torch is conspicuous, symbol of man's illuminating by his courageous industry the blackness of ignorance—stealing fire from heaven and training clever artificers to work in fire for mankind—symbol also of mystic light in the midst of gloom.

The cult statue of Vesta, as we may judge from coins and medallions as well as from ancient notices, showed her draped in a long robe, wearing a veil on her head, and carrying in one hand a lamp, in the other a javelin. The latter is in some replicas replaced by the Palladium, while on a few medallions there is in both attributes departure from the ordinary type, the one being a drum, the other a Nike. We must believe that the lamp and the javelin are her original symbols, for which, as the cult developed, there might be substitutions. The former would suggest the fire of the hearth; the latter, which is preëminently a Roman and Volscian weapon, should afford an important clue to the origin of this form of religion at Rome.

The traditions which were current concerning the founding of the community of Vestals who served the goddess lead one to believe that the institution was of Italic, or primitive Roman, origin, later modified by Etruscan influence. Numa, it is said, first made the chosen number of Vestals four; Tarquinius Priscus increased the number to six. The literary legend of Aeneas saw in him the first founder of the community; more primitive is the story that the mother of Father Romulus was a Vestal. It is certainly at Alba Longa, the home of her father Numitor, that archaeologists derive the most trustworthy data regarding the earliest history of Rome. Curiously enough, her second name, often substituted for the more familiar Rhea, is Ilia, suggestive at least of Troy. In historic times all girls from six to ten years of age, whether of plebeian or patrician family, were eligible as Vestals, provided that they were without blemish. Their term of self-oblation was thirty years, ten of which were spent in learning the duties of their office, ten in performing them, ten in instructing others. Their care was the preservation of the fire on which the

¹This paper was read at the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Baltimore, May 2, 1913.

safety of Rome depended, to which was added another charge, the guarding of a mysterious object, possibly the Palladium, on which also the fortunes of the city hung. If this second duty really concerned the Palladium, it is easy to understand why an idol of this type appears as an attribute on certain representations of the cult statue, and it is tempting to find in the legend of Aeneas something more important than an artificial literary tradition. At any rate, the chief occupation of these priestesses was to tend the sacred fire. If by mischance the flame should be extinguished, it must be rekindled by glasses from the sun itself, and the unfortunate Vestal was severely chastised by the Pontifex Maximus, who, under the Republic and the Empire, selected the Vestals, and had general oversight of them. They were bound by a strict law of chastity, to violate which meant death to the sinner and grave danger to the state. Numa's enactment required that the penalty for this infringement should be death by stoning; under the elder Tarquin's dispensation the culprit was immured alive and left to starve after she should have exhausted the scanty supply of food entombed with her. Both modes of punishment indicate that the person of the Vestal was sacrosanct, her violent death to be accomplished by methods in which, according to the view of primitive peoples, man was not an agent. The community life of this little group of Vesta's servants was, apart from the grim menace of the visitation which would follow disobedience to the precept of the order, pleasant and luxurious. Many immunities and great honors accompanied the office, among which the most striking is the fact that even consuls, meeting a Vestal on the street, must give her precedence—and this at Rome where theoretically children were not akin to the mother and woman was in *patria potestate*. It is difficult not to see in this great honor shown to the Vestals a survival of the matriarchate.

The temple of Vesta, as was clearly demonstrated by the late Professor George Olcott of Columbia University, was undoubtedly a survival of the old Italic hut-urn, the type of ash-urn which belongs to the Iron Age civilization of central and southern Etruria and Latium, where it takes the place of the Villanova urn of other regions. It is noteworthy that, outside the limits designated, this circular hut-urn is not found in Italy. Professor Olcott inferred that therein we might see the form of the primitive Roman hut before the time of the Tarquins, from which structure is derived historically, not only the Roman building with a cupola, as the Pantheon, but also, through the Roman development, the modern domed building. It should be added that specimens of this form of hut-urn have been found in Germany, and also in prehistoric Crete, in which lands it is not typical. Its origin remains a puzzle. All that can safely be asserted of

the temple of Vesta, judged as a structure of this type, is that therein was preserved the typical house of the primitive Italic peoples of Latium and southern and central Etruria.

To gather up the lessons, which, like a fable, each division of the subject-matter may teach, we may make these statements:

The details of the cult itself contribute most to the modern understanding of this worship in the quaint ceremonies of the Vestalia, whence one divines why Vesta was dear to the common folk as a deity who carried a step further the benefactions of Ceres. Consequently it is not at all surprising to find that by mythographers Vesta is often confounded with the Grain-Giving Mother. Furthermore, in that Vesta symbolises the hearth, she is an exact counterpart of the Greek Hestia; and the parallelism extends further, for Vesta of the Vestalia is the bread-makers' goddess, the giver of homely food to hungry mouths, and whence, if not from a similar conception, comes the Greek *ἐστία*, as also the hospitable modern *ἑστιατόριον*? The Greek carried the genial thought a little further into every-day life—that is all. This Vesta, because of her kindness to man, because also, as a deity of simple folk, she was the patroness of flocks and herds, was peculiarly dear to the Latin people, and was therefore a 'hoary', or venerable, witness of solemn oaths, in which connection she is most intimately bound to the odd group of Lares, Penates, and the rest. Roman poets—not Vergil alone—quite consistently assert a Trojan origin for all these divinities, while Vergil openly states that the hero of his epic brought the image of Vesta along with the *patrii Penates* from Troy (Aen. 2.296). Critics have much to say of the artificial legend of Aeneas foisted on Roman history by the genius of the great Mantuan, but, when one pauses to consider how bold it would have been for the poet in speaking of the most precious divinities of Roman religion to claim for them an origin unwarranted by sacred orthodox opinion, one is inclined to believe that in his statement there is much fidelity to the views of Romans in general. The word *Lar* suggests the Etruscan *Lars*. Possibly the worship of the Lares was one of the many spiritual gifts of Etruria to Rome, and possibly such a theory has its place in the critical study of the legend of Aeneas. However one regards the tradition of the Trojan origin of Vesta, one must hold that this tradition actually impressed itself at some period, whether early or late, on the cult itself; in no other way may be explained the Palladium in the hand of the goddess, as she is portrayed on certain medallions. Thus, too, must be explained the obscure statements in ancient writers about the Palladium which the Vestals guarded.

The two attributes most frequently associated with the cult image, the lamp and the javelin, declare

her to have been an armed goddess of flame. To realize that Vesta was armed is at first startling; the bearings of the fact are apparent when one interprets the flame not only as the fire of the hearth, but also as the symbol of the Anatolian Mother, who was a warrior goddess, protector of the state, and bestower of fertility. At once it becomes plain why in ancient literature Vesta is confounded with Rhea, Cybele, Gaia, Ops, and other female deities of fertility. It is as one of these that at times she carries Rhea-Cybele's drum; the Palladium, too, would justly be her attribute in this capacity. The Nike, a common attribute, proves nothing. Curiously enough, Vesta's weapon is distinctly Italic, whence it would seem that she is an Italic divinity with characteristics of the Anatolian Mother, or—to state it conversely—a form of the Anatolian Mother, modified by Italic traits.

She is, as was the Mother, Protector of the State, *Πολιοῦχος*, in that on the chastity of her priestesses depends the safety of the state, and this very vow of chastity, the sacrifice of womanhood to the revered deity, finds its best parallels in the practices of Anatolian shrines where women, as well as men, strove to devote themselves utterly to the Mother. If in Magna Mater's worship there actually are preserved memories of the primitive matriarchate, there may herein be a clue to the reason for the distinguished honors paid to the Vestals.

The evidence furnished by the shape of the temple indicates that the cult was Italic, to which theory there are contributions in the facts that the weapon which Vesta bears is Italic and that tradition saw in Numa either the institutor of the Vestals, or one who made important rules for their order. The story of Romulus is also of value here, in that it makes his mother a Vestal from Alba Longa, the Italic town which was the mother of Rome². The problem of the Italic hut-urn is intricate and baffling. Because it belongs to portions of Etruria as well as to Latium, it is tempting to believe that the type is the outgrowth of Etruscan modifications of the Villanova urn, but authorities are in no wise agreed about the relative dates of Italic and Etruscan civilizations in Etruria. As a matter of fact there are to be found ash-urns now and then in graves which are certainly Etruscan, but where incineration rather than inhumation has been the rite of burial, and invariably these urns are square, of the type of the familiar specimens from Tarquinii. Indubitably the cult of Vesta was not uninfluenced by the Etruscans, as is shown by the tradition of the Elder Tarquin's innovations in the college of the Vestals.

As a tentative solution of the many difficulties I would offer this theory: Vesta was an Italo-Etrus-

can deity, i.e. one indigenous among the Italic invaders of Latium (as Hestia belonged to their Aryan kindred who forced a way into Greece), but whose rites were modified after the Etruscan conquest of Latium. Accepting the main stream of ancient tradition³, which held that the Etruscans were of Lydian origin, I find corroborative evidence for the theory in the fact that the goddess was, in fundamental conception as in symbol, easily confused with various deities, all of whom are forms of the Mother worshipped in Lydia and adjacent lands. In the light of these facts must be considered the tradition, probably more vigorous than has been supposed, that connects Vesta with Asiatic Troy. Herodotus names Hestia (2.50) as a Pelasgic deity and again (4.59) as a divinity particularly sacred among the Scythians. If, with Professor Ridgeway, one interprets Pelasgic as a term referring to the stock to which in a general way 'Minoans', 'Mycenaeans', and their prehistoric kinsfolk of Lydia belong, one secures further support for the theory of Anatolian influence exerted by the Etruscans on the cult of Vesta. For Vesta and Hestia are clearly very similar, the type being the same. Moreover, that Herodotus is speaking of a type is plainly evident from the second passage (4.59) wherein he gives the Scythian name for the goddess whom he calls Hestia. One might infer that the Hestia of the Greeks was, like Vesta, both Aryan and 'Pelasgic'.

The simplest paper on any subject in ancient religion must bring in many of these vague words—Pelasgic, Etruscan, Italic, and the like,—but fascinating certainly are the countless problems involved and, one may hope, an attempt to deal with any of them is not wholly valueless. One puzzles over the threads, and when one thinks that he discerns a pattern, he is immeasurably cheered.

FLORENCE M. BENNETT.

NORMAL COLLEGE, New York City.

NOTES ON HORACE¹

I

In Horace's account, in the first Ode, of the varied pursuits of men all but one of the persons mentioned are clearly to be regarded as types. Two of them are introduced by the class-names *mercator* (16) and *venator* (26). The soldier is described by the clause *multos castra invant* (23), and the small farmer by the participial phrase, *gaudentem patrios findere sarculo agros* (11). The correlative words *hunc* (7) and *illum* (9), which introduce the politician and the great landowner, ostensibly point out definite individuals; but when, as here, they have

² Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who names Xanthus as his source, is the only extant ancient writer who states a different opinion.

³ This paper was read at the Seventh Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Baltimore, May 3, 1913.

² It would be interesting to speculate why she was named Rhea Silvia, Rhea, by the way, the name of a deity, being, like Vesta and Hestia, of Indo-European origin.

no antecedents in the context, they really stand for types.

There remains the description in 19-22:

Est qui nec veteris pocula Massici
nec partem solido demere de die
spernit, nunc viridi membra sub arbuto
stratus, nunc ad aquae lene caput sacrae.

Nothing here indicates that the poet has in mind a whole class of men. It is merely the fact that types, not individuals, precede and follow which has led some readers to assume that the man who enjoys a picnic in the country is a mere abstraction. But, if Horace wanted us to take this view, why did he throw us off the track by using the singular number? *Est qui* stands in sharp contrast to *sunt quos* in line 3, much as it does in Epp. 2. 2. 182:

sunt qui non habeant, est qui non curat habere.

The contrast is heightened by the use of *multos* immediately afterward in line 23. In view of Horace's minutely careful workmanship it seems dangerous to neglect so plain a hint; *est qui* points, as Professor Shorey says (ad loc., in edition 1), "pretty plainly . . . to one who shall be nameless".

Now, though Horace does not mention the name, he intends, of course, that we shall guess it. Professor Hale has suggested (Cum Constructions, 112) that *est qui* refers to the author, and it is true that the tone is one which the poet affects when speaking of himself (see e.g. Epp. 1. 5). The difficulty with such an interpretation does not appear until one reaches the last eight lines, where Horace contrasts his own supreme interest with other men's ruling motives. By supposing that he has already introduced himself in a different rôle we destroy the climax.

If the phrase *est qui* cannot refer to the writer of the poem, one naturally turns to the person addressed. That Maecenas was not averse to leisurely enjoyment is well known, but perhaps it is worth while to quote from Velleius Paterculus's description of him (2. 88. 2) a few words that may almost be thought of as a commentary on this passage: . . . vir ubi res vigiliam exigeret sane exsomnis, providens, atque agendi sciens, simul vero aliquid ex negotio remitti posset, otio ac mollitiis paene ultra feminam fluens. . . .

It may perhaps be objected that in an ode written to honor Maecenas Horace would not have alluded to the less energetic side of his patron's character. Horace, however, has only praise for the sort of thing described in these lines, and there is no evidence that Maecenas cared to pose as a devotee of the strenuous life. He seems in fact to have been singularly free from the sort of vanity which leads one, on the negative side, to respect the taboo of an unreasonable public opinion, and, on the positive side, to seek political or social advancement. Many persons did, as a matter of fact, disapprove

of Maecenas's occasional self-indulgence; but Horace was not one of these, and Maecenas was not the man to be afraid of an opinion which he did not share.

Furthermore, Horace does actually address Maecenas in other poems very much as we conclude that he does here. Particularly significant is the parallelism between the four lines under discussion and the opening stanzas of the twenty-ninth Ode of Book three, an ode which seems to have been originally intended for the final place in the collection, and which may therefore be thought of as a farewell address to Maecenas balancing the dedicatory poem (cf. Wickham, ad loc., and in his editio maior¹, p. 8): 'For you, Maecenas, scion of Tuscan kings, mild wine in a cask unbroached and bloom of roses and perfume pressed for you I've long had in store. Make an end of delay; gaze not forever <from afar> at Tibur of many rills, the sloping plain of Aefula, or the hills where dwelt Telegonus, slayer of his sire. Come away from cloying plenty and your pile that's neighbor to the clouds of heaven; stop marvelling at the smoke and wealth and noise of prosperous Rome'.

If it is true that lines 19-22 refer to Maecenas, it follows that the poem as a whole was written for its present place and purpose; we cannot, with Nauck, ad loc., Earle, The Classical Review 16. 400, and others, suppose that a poem on the varied occupations of men has been retouched by the addition of a few lines at the beginning and the end so as to form a dedication to Maecenas. The one indication that the Ode has such a composite character is the fact that by cutting off the first two and the last two lines we get an Ode a large part of which falls neatly into stanzas of four lines each. This consideration, however, if it proves anything, proves too much. If Horace took pains in the first place to divide the Ode into quatrains, we can scarcely believe that he wantonly destroyed that structure just because it was a little easier to add two lines at the beginning instead of four. We are driven to the utterly untenable position of ascribing the lines which mention Maecenas not to Horace but to some copyist or editor of the poems.

But why should a poem of this type be divided into quatrains? The other five Odes (1. 11, 18; 3. 30; 4. 8, 10) which contain lines of only one metrical form show no tendency to place a sentence pause at the close of every fourth line. If we divide them into quatrains we find that our division points correspond with sentence pauses in only five places out of a possible seventeen; and the division into stanzas breaks down completely in the case of the eighth Ode of Book four, which contains 34 lines².

² In view of the difficulties which most editors have found in accepting this Ode as it stands as Horatian, it should hardly figure in such a discussion as this. On the question whether Horace composed his Odes in stanzas see Wickham, editio Maior, pages 387-388.

Similarly in the seventeenth Epode, which consists of a series of iambic trimeters, a sentence pause coincides with the end of a quatrain in only seven places out of a total of twenty, and the poem contains a number of lines that is not divisible by four. It is therefore improbable that Horace cared to divide into stanzas an Ode whose lines were all alike.

The first Ode, then, seems to have been written as a whole for the place which it occupies. There is a touch of mild and altogether Horatian humor in bringing Maecenas into the list of the classes of mankind in a rôle which, superficially at least, is less heroic than any of the others. As a matter of fact, however, Horace contrives to suggest the absurdity of all the other pursuits of men; even his own wooing of the muse leads up to the almost grotesque

sublimi feriam sidera vertice.

One surely gets the impression that after all, in the poet's estimation, the most rational philosophy of life is the one that is here ascribed to Maecenas: 'I know a man who is not above cups of old Massic wine and stealing an hour from the day's work while he lies beneath a green arbut or beside a gentle spring, haunt of the nymphs'.

II

It is perhaps the innate malice of human nature that has led to the persistent attempts of scholars to identify the principal character in Horace's ninth satire—the famous 'bore'. I confess complete ignorance of his name, but I should like to suggest a theory as to his nationality.

Aristius Fuscus's little jest about the sinfulness of telling secrets on the Sabbath seems natural enough to us, the heirs of New England puritanism. But was it not a bit far-fetched for a Roman to assume Hebrew scruples even in fun? It was this feeling, no doubt, that led Krüger to remark: "die Worte des Aristius Fuscus erscheinen um so beissender wenn man annimmt dass Horaz . . . jetzt bis in den *vicus Tuscus*, das römische Judenviertel, . . . gekommen ist". The thrust was keener still if the third member of the group was himself a Jew. 'I haven't forgotten', says Fuscus, 'but I'll tell you at a more suitable time; this is the thirtieth Sabbath: do you want to insult these mutilated Jews?' The very obvious insult already administered leaves Horace just breath enough for four words: *Nulla mihi religio est*.

It is not hard to detect the Hebrew character in Horace's account of the bore. That singleness of purpose, that unconquerable determination which has put many Jews among the greatest of mankind too often degenerates, under less favorable circumstances, into just such pushing and climbing as is here pictured. 'I'm not going to get discouraged; I'll bribe his servants; I won't give up if they do

shut the door in my face; I'll watch my chance, meet him at the corner, and walk down town with him. We mortals have to work for all life's blessings'.

Again, the three accomplishments which the bore mentions (23 ff.) in recommending himself to Horace are just such as would appeal to an ambitious member of a downtrodden race.

Nam quis me scribere pluris
aut citius possit versus? Quis membra movere
mollius? Invideat quod et Hermogenes ego
canto.

Professor Knapp has shown (*American Journal of Philology*, 18. 336 f.) that Horace elsewhere holds up to scorn precisely these three accomplishments, and he argues that no man in real life would have been perversely stupid enough to approach Horace in just this way. But it is not a mere coincidence that the ambitious upstart affects the very forms of art which Horace most frequently combats. A man who has forced himself up from the bottom and is still excluded from the most cultured circles is not likely to have very good taste, and he has little opportunity for getting acquainted with the best art of his day. If he aspires to be an artist at all he is almost certain to choose the vulgar and showy perversions of art which force themselves upon everybody's attention—that is to say, precisely those aspects of the artistic life of the time for which a true artist cherishes a most active dislike.

No one would care to maintain that Horace has given us a stenographic account of a real conversation. He has no doubt omitted much, added something, and retouched the whole. On the foundation of a real incident he has built a work of art; but in so doing he has not made the bore say anything inconsistent with his character or with the dramatic situation.

III

The lines immediately following those we have been discussing have puzzled the commentators. When the list of vulgar and inartistic accomplishments has got as far as the singing which would make Hermogenes envious, Horace has to interrupt (*Interpellandi locus hic erat*). 'Have you a mother or kinsmen', he says, 'for whom it is necessary that you continue to live?' The implication is, I think, that Horace is angry enough to commit murder, but he first inquires whether the fellow has any dependent relatives. The bore, however, completely misses the point; he thinks that Horace has really been impressed and is now trying to discover whether he has another important qualification of a true friend—lack of natural heirs. On that point he hopes to give complete satisfaction: 'Not one; I've buried them all'. At this Horace throws up his hands: 'Lucky fellows! Now it's my turn; finish the job'.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

REVIEW

Aristotle on the Art of Poetry. An Amplified Version with Supplementary Illustrations for Students of English. By Lane Cooper, Assistant Professor of English in Cornell University. Boston: Ginn and Company (1913). Pp. xiii + 101. 80 cents¹.

Prof. Lane Cooper has done a useful piece of work in his "amplified version" of Aristotle's Poetics. The book is intended primarily for students of English, but the many illustrations taken from English authors are likely to be valuable to students of the Classics as well, for they direct attention in an interesting way to the fundamental and universal character of the Greek treatise. Thorough students of English ought to know the Poetics at first hand, but if our present tendencies to work along lines of least resistance preclude this, they will hardly find a better guide than Professor Cooper has furnished them. His method is to give a free translation, and then to add, unseparated from the general text, but in brackets, a miscellaneous commentary. Occasionally a little of what might well be commentary gets into the text, as when in the first chapter the essential quality or function of each species of poetic art is said to be "equivalent to the proper and characteristic effect of each on the trained sensibilities of the judicious"—good Aristotelian doctrine, no doubt, but foreign to the Greek of this passage. In the main, however, the author has made his translation follow the original without undue explanatory interpolation, and has constructed his commentary with good sense and tact. He has made careful use of Bywater's almost final edition of the Poetics, and of the work of other scholars, not forgetting the old, but still valuable, commentary of Tyrwhitt. He has been careful, too, in the matter of cross-references—a very important thing for the student of this treatise. The comment on the puzzling contradiction in chapters xiii and xiv (very likely ultimately a textual difficulty) between the two views, that the best tragedies end unhappily, and that the horror of the tragic act is most effective when the act becomes imminent, but is not carried out, is fully recognized by Professor Cooper, and judiciously treated. Less judicious is his statement (p. 35) that the peripety, or reversal, in the *Oedipus Rex*, "as we know the play", is not brought about by the messenger, as Aristotle says it is. Bywater's words are more to the point: "It is, as

¹ I venture to suggest another interpretation. When the stranger has finished the catalogue of his own merits, Horace rejoins, 'Heavens! You're so clever, you're in danger of death'. That such an idea is not un-Roman may be seen by a glance at Horace, *Sermones* 2.7. 2-4, where Davus describes himself as Davus, amicum mancipium domino et frugi, quod sit satis, hoc est, ut vitale putes. See the editors there. C. K.

² When I requested Professor Wheeler to review this book, I found that he had already noticed the work for *The Nation*, on September 18 last. With his consent, and by the courtesy of Dr. Paul Elmer More, the review is here reprinted. C. K.

Aristotle says, the natural result of the arrival of the Messenger and his disclosure in the preceding scene". The implication that Aristotle may have known a somewhat differently constructed play is surely unnecessary. In the matter of typography, what advantage is there in printing Greek words and phrases in English italics? To one who knows Greek letters the practice seems a barbarism; and what profit is it to the student of English, when he does not know them, if he is simply enabled to mispronounce a lot of syllables he does not understand? If, however, one does print in this way, the inconsistent use of initial "K" and "C" (pages 9 and 72) needs revision. But these are small matters. The book is excellent and to be cordially recommended.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

J. R. WHEELER.

THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB: PROGRAMME FOR 1913-1914

The programme for the fourteenth year of The New York Latin Club is marked by an interesting departure, in that two of the addresses will be illustrated by lantern slides. For such addresses the Hotel Gregorian, at which the Club has met for several years, offer no facilities, and it was found impossible, in spite of earnest efforts, to make suitable arrangements with any other hotel. This year, therefore, the luncheons will be held at Columbia University, the luncheons in University Hall 327, the illustrated addresses in Havermeyer Hall 309.

The programme is as follows:

November 15: Professor J. R. S. Sterrett, of Cornell University, will speak on *The Troglodytic Dwellings in Cappadocia*.

February 7: Professor Walton Brooks McDaniel, of the University of Pennsylvania, will speak on *Pliny and Lake Como*.

May 23: Professor Duane Reed Stuart, of Princeton University, will speak on *Ancient and Modern Attempts to Rehabilitate Personalities*.

All persons who are in any way interested in the Classics are cordially invited to attend the luncheons. A determined effort will be made to start the luncheons promptly at noon, that the major part of the afternoon may still be available after adjournment.

Persons interested may communicate with Dr. W. F. Tibbetts, Treasurer of The New York Latin Club, at Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, making remittance in accordance with the following table of joint rates in the interests of The New York Latin Club and The Classical Association of the Atlantic States:

(1) For three luncheons and membership in The New York Latin Club, \$2.75.

(2) For the matters covered in 1, and membership in The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, which carries with it *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, \$4.25.

(3) For the matters covered in 2, and subscription to *The Classical Journal*, \$5.25.

(4) For the matters covered in 3, and subscription to *Classical Philology*, \$6.92.

Those who have already paid dues to The Classical Association of the Atlantic States may deduct \$2.00 from the figures named in 2, 3, 4, and 50 cents from the figure named in 1.